



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IFN
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,203	02/21/2001	Ariel Katz	1018.126US1	5124
22971	7590	09/07/2005	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399			LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED
OIPE/IAP

SEP 13 2005

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/681,203	KATZ ET AL.
	Examiner Christian La Forgia	Art Unit 2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-14 and 16-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4-14 and 16-36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01 August 2005 has been entered.
2. Claims 1, 4-14, and 16-36 have been presented for examination.
3. Claims 2, 3, and 15 have been cancelled as per Applicant's request.

Response to Arguments

4. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation a proxy has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).
5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-14, and 16-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
6. See further rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-14, 16, 18-28, 31, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,636,838 to Perlman et al., hereinafter Perlman.
10. As per claims 1 and 33, Perlman teaches a proxy method comprising:
 - receiving encrypted data from a client over an unsecure network (Figures 4 [block 408], 5 [block 506], 10 [blocks 1006, 1008], column 5, lines 21-25, column 6, lines 1-2, column 6, lines 27-31, column 6, lines 51-61, column 9, lines 12-24);
 - decrypting the encrypted data into decrypted data (Figures 4 [block 412], 5 [block 514], 10 [block 1016], column 5, lines 21-25, column 6, lines 3-14, column 6, lines 32-39, column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 7, column 9, lines 29-31);
 - examining the decrypted data for security purposes (Figures 4 [block 414], 5 [block 516], 10 [block 1018], column 5, lines 26-32, column 6, lines 40-47, column 7, line 1-7, column 9, lines 32-36),
 - re-encrypting the examined decrypted data (column 5, lines 37-50); and

sending the re-encrypted data to an origin server over a given network (Figure 5 [block 518], 10 [block 1020], column 5, lines 37-50, column 6, lines 48-50, column 7, lines 1-7, column 9, lines 34-36).

11. Regarding claim 4, Perlman teaches wherein the given network is a secure network (Figure 1 [block 109], column 4, lines 51-61).

12. With regards to claims 5 and 16, Perlman discloses wherein the sending is in accordance with one of the hypertext transport protocol (HTTP), the post office protocol (POP), the wireless access protocol (WAP), or the Internet messaging access protocol (IMAP) (column 4, lines 32-38, column 5, lines 51-67, i.e. wireless communications, “an e-mail message”).

13. Regarding claim 6, Perlman teaches wherein the given network is one of the unsecure network and a second unsecure network (column 4, lines 51-61).

14. Regarding claims 8 and 19, Perlman teaches wherein the unsecure network is the Internet (Figure 1 [block 104], column 4, lines 32-39).

15. Regarding claims 9 and 24, Perlman teaches wherein the origin server is an effective origin server (column 4, lines 25-31).

16. Regarding claims 10 and 23, Perlman teaches wherein the client is an effective client (column 4, lines 25-31).

17. Regarding claims 11 and 25, Perlman teaches wherein the method is performed by a proxy within the given network (Figures 1 [block 106], 2 [block 106], 3 [block 106], 4, 5, 9 [blocks 106, 108], 10, column 4, line 20 to column 7, line 7).

18. Regarding claims 12 and 26, Perlman teaches wherein the method is performed by a firewall within the given network (Figures 1 [block 106], 2 [block 106], 3 [block 106], 4, 5, 9 [blocks 106, 108], 10, column 4, line 20 to column 7, line 7).

19. Regarding claims 13 and 27, Perlman teaches a computer-readable medium having a computer program stored thereon for execution by a processor (column 4, lines 6-18, claims 3-4).

20. As per claim 14, Perlman teaches a proxy method comprising:
receiving unencrypted data from a client over an secure network (column 4, lines 32-37);
examining the unencrypted data for security purposes (Figures 4 [block 414], 5 [block 516], 10 [block 1018], column 4, lines 38-50, column 5, lines 26-32, column 6, lines 40-47, column 7, line 1-7, column 9, lines 32-36),
in response to the examining yielding that the unencrypted data does not present a security risk:

encrypting the unencrypted data into encrypted data (column 5, lines 37-50); and sending the encrypted data to an origin server over an unsecure network (Figure 5 [block 518], 10 [block 1020], column 5, lines 37-50, column 6, lines 48-50, column 7, lines 1-7, column 9, lines 34-36).

21. Regarding claim 18, Perlman teaches wherein the secure network is a carrier network (column 4, lines 6-18).

22. Regarding claim 20, Perlman teaches wherein the client is a thin client (column 4, lines 25-31).

23. Regarding claim 21, Perlman teaches wherein the client is one of a: personal digital assistant (PDA) device, a laptop computer, a notebook computer, and a wireless phone (column 4, lines 25-31).

24. Regarding claim 22, Perlman teaches wherein the secure network is one of a wireless network or a wired network (column 4, lines 32-38).

25. As per claim 28, Perlman teaches a system comprising:
a client to send encrypted data over an unsecure network (Figures 4 [block 408], 5 [block 506], 10 [blocks 1006, 1008], column 5, lines 21-25, column 6, lines 1-2, column 6, lines 27-31, column 6, lines 51-61, column 9, lines 12-24);

a proxy within a secure network to receive the encrypted data, decrypt the encrypted data into decrypted data, perform a test relative to the decrypted data, and send the decrypted data over the secure network in response to the test yielding a particular response (Figures 4 [blocks 412, 414], 5 [blocks 514, 516], 10 [blocks 1016, 1018], column 5, lines 21-25, column 5, lines 37- 50, column 6, lines 3-14, column 6, lines 32-39, column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 7, column 9, lines 29-31); and,

an origin server within the secure network to receive the decrypted data (Figure 5 [block 518], 10 [block 1020], column 5, lines 37-50, column 6, lines 48-50, column 7, lines 1-7, column 9, lines 34-36).

26. As per claim 31, Perlman teaches a system comprising:

a client to send unencrypted data over a secure network (column 4, lines 32-37);
a proxy within the secure network to receive the unencrypted data, perform a test relative to the unencrypted data encrypt the unencrypted data into encrypted data, and send the encrypted data over an unsecure network in response to the test yielding a particular response (Figures 4 [blocks 412, 414], 5 [blocks 514, 516], 10 [blocks 1016, 1018], column 5, lines 21-25, column 5, lines 37- 50, column 6, lines 3-14, column 6, lines 32-39, column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 7, column 9, lines 29-31); and,

an origin server to receive the encrypted data (Figure 5 [block 518], 10 [block 1020], column 5, lines 37-50, column 6, lines 48-50, column 7, lines 1-7, column 9, lines 34-36).

27. Regarding claim 34, Perlman teaches wherein the first network is a secure network (column 4, lines 32-37).

28. Regarding claim 35, Perlman teaches wherein the second network is an unsecure network, such that sending the data to the origin server over the second network in the second hop comprises first encrypting the data (Figure 5 [block 518], 10 [block 1020], column 5, lines 37-50, column 6, lines 48-50, column 7, lines 1-7, column 9, lines 34-36).

29. Regarding claim 36, Perlman teaches wherein the second network is a secure network (column 4, lines 51-61).

30. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,327 to Jardin, hereinafter Jardin.

31. Regarding claims 7 and 17, Perlman does not disclose wherein the receiving is within a secure socket layer (SSL) session.

32. Jardin teaches wherein the receiving is within a secure socket layer (SSL) session (column 1, lines 23-37).

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to send the information over an SSL session, since Jardin states at column 1, line 38 to column 2, line 13 that such a modification would serve as authentication and encryption, thereby deterring hackers from eavesdropping and acquiring user information.

34. Claims 29, 30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman.

35. Regarding claim 29, Perlman discloses a client within a secure network to send unencrypted data over the secure network; a proxy within the secure network to receive the unencrypted data, encrypt the unencrypted data into encrypted data, perform a test relative to the unencrypted data, and send the encrypted data over an unsecure network in response to the test yielding a particular response as seen in the rejections above.

36. Perlman does not disclose a second client and a second proxy.

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a second client and second proxy, since it has been held that duplicating a part to have a multiple effect requires only ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2144.04; see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

38. Regarding claim 30, Perlman discloses a client to send second encrypted data over the unsecure network in an additional hop; a proxy to receive the encrypted data, decrypt the encrypted data into decrypted data, perform a test relative to the decrypted data, encrypt the decrypted data into encrypted data, and send the encrypted data over the unsecure network in response the test yielding a particular response as discussed above.

39. Perlman does not disclose a second client and a second proxy.

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a second client and second proxy, since it has been held that duplicating a part to have a multiple effect requires only ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2144.04; see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

41. Regarding claim 32, Perlman discloses a proxy within a secure network to receive encrypted data, decrypt the encrypted data into decrypted data, and send the decrypted data over the secure network; and a origin server within the secure network to receive the decrypted data as illustrated above.

42. Perlman does not disclose a second proxy or a second origin server.

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a second proxy and a second server, since it has been held that duplicating a part to have a multiple effect requires only ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2144.04; see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

Claim Objections

44. Claims 11 and 25 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claims, or amend the claims to place the claims in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claims in independent form. Claims 11 and 25 are directed toward the method being performed by a proxy, which is moot since the Applicant has amended the preamble of the claims to state that the method is a proxy method.

Conclusion

45. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

46. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to content screening, such as:

United States Patent No. 5,850,449 to McManis, which is cited to show content screening communications between two entities through a firewall.

47. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (571) 272-3792. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

48. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

49. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christian LaForgia
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131
clf

Ayaz Sheikh
AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Notice of References Cited		Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 09/681,203 KATZ ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit Christian La Forgia	2131 Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-6,636,838	10-2003	Perlman et al.	705/51
	B	US-6,681,327	01-2004	Jardin, Cary A.	713/153
	C	US-5,850,449	12-1998	McManis, Charles E.	713/161
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

NOV 10 1971

Organization _____ Bldg./Room _____
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Not Deliverable Unable to Forward
 Insufficient Address Moved, Left No Address
 Unclaimed Aliens
 No Such Street Not Known
 Vacant No Mail
 Box Message Letter Other _____

